



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

observed that in the form קטות the Hölēm is ordinarily written fully, which is much more common when it comes from contraction than from obscuration.

In the perfect of verbs with original י, such forms as קטות, contracted from קטות, would be expected, instead of the usual form קטית, contracted from קטית. No such form with the vowel י occurs. There are perfects, however, with a י before the affix, the origin of which has been difficult of explanation. "Eine befriedigende Erklärung dieser Trennungsvokale ist noch nicht gelungen."¹ These are the perfects of the ע"ע verb in all the stems, and of the ע"י verb in the Niph'al and Hiph'il. It is probable, as many have maintained, that the י found in the imperfects and imperatives of the same verbs is from the analogy of the ל"ל verbs. The writer would suggest that this י is also to be so regarded, being taken not from the ל"ל verb, but from the י"י. It need occasion no surprise that the analogous formation has remained, while the original one has been lost. This is sufficiently natural when formations by analogy are so common as they are in Hebrew, and, in fact, in all the Semitic languages.

It is probable that the י"י forms had become few when the vowel was taken by the ע"ע and ע"י verbs. For the addition of this vowel in these verbs in the Hebrew is evidently a late formation, as is indicated by the fact that there are few if any similar forms in the other Semitic languages. That a relatively infrequent formation should be taken by one occurring more frequently has numerous parallels. "Indessen geschieht es nicht so selten, dass gerade die wenigen Formen über die zahlreicheren siegen: so haben vor Suffix und in konstruierter Stellung im Hebräischen und Aramäischen die Dualformen über die Pluralformen und der Plur. sanus über den Plur. fractus beim Substantiv gesiegt, obwohl der letztere im genannten Dialekt, wie thatsächlich im Südsemitischen, einmal wahrscheinlich weit zahlreicher als der erstere war."²

GEORGE RICKER BERRY.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
May 15, 1904.

SISINNU = "HORSEBIRD" = OSTRICH.

In III R. 15, I, 15, we have reference to the si-si-in-ni bird; the king compares his onset to the rush of this great bird. For the reading si-si-in-ni as against si-er-in-ni (Delitzsch), cf. Robert Francis Harper (Dissertation), 1888, and Haupt in BAS., I, 167, where Harper's reading si-si-in-ni is confirmed by both Haupt and Pinches. Haupt has conjectured that this form is a derivative from sisu, "horse;" si-si-in-nu = sisēnu = sisānu: we are consequently to read it "horse-bird." There is reason to suspect the conjecture is well-founded. In

¹ Ges.-K., § 67d, n. 1.

² Lindberg, *Vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, S. 134, n. 1.

the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January, 1903, E. H. Parker discusses Chinese knowledge of early Persia, giving some interesting translations from early Chinese historians. The kingdom of Persia is called An-sih (= Ar-sak, Arsaces) by them; the first Chinese envoy visiting it about 140 B. C., and the earliest history being compiled before 85 B. C. This early envoy is impressed with the "great bird's eggs." The next reference is in a history of the early Han dynasty (B. C. 206–A. D. 25). This history is brought down to A. D. 5; and in the accounts of visits to the Persian empire the envoys are impressed with the "great horse-birds" of that region. The accounts are noteworthy for minuteness and general accuracy, and for their efforts to give local names of things or places seen. In the history of the later Han dynasty (A. D. 25–220) presents of lions and "great T'iao-chi birds" are mentioned, with "great bird-eggs like jars." These birds, the writer tells us, were later known in China as 'An-sih birds' (Persian birds). He leaves us in no doubt as to the identity of T'iao-chi: "From the Pamirs westward are Ta-yüan, An-sih, T'iao-chi, and Wu-yi. These four states in this order lie west, being the original states, without increase or diminution. . . . Former generations absurdly held that T'iao-chi was more powerful than An-sih; but now, far from being so, it is vassal to the latter, and is styled the western limit of An-sih." We know whence these great birds were obtained. In the next history referring to this region, dealing with the period A. D. 400–650, we are again told of "great bird-eggs. There is a great bird like a camel, having two wings which enable it to fly along, but not to rise. It eats grass and flesh; it can also swallow fire." In A. D. 620 we again hear of tribute or presents of great birds' eggs from An-sih.

In these accounts the ostrich is unmistakable. The Chinese historians for 800 years seem peculiarly impressed with it. They at first understand it to be the "horse-bird." They later call it, in China, the Persian bird. Its habitat is understood to be the decayed empire immediately west of Persia. The detailed description, when the name "horse-bird" has become obsolete, suggesting that the bird looks like a camel, recalls the *στρονθιο-καμήλος*, or "camel-bird," of Diodorus, Strabo, and Pliny. It is not impossible that the *sisinnu* may be the bird shown to the Chinese envoys; and the rush of an angry ostrich affords an excellent simile for the royal charge. Xenophon also (*Anabasis*, I, 5, 3) mentions the ostrich as abundant along the Euphrates, 150 miles below Thapsacus; and his description of its running "using its wings as a sail," is parallel to the Chinese historian's description of "a great bird like a camel."

amêlu KUL = ḥêpû = WOODCUTTER.

In the *Code of Hammurabi*, 39, 29, Harper reads the workman as an amêlu KUL. The sign KUL has as its principal meanings, abātu, ḥabātu, ḥipû, "to destroy, remove, break down, cut down." We have also the PUR.KUL (*HWB.*, 542) = a stone-cutter; and in Brünnow, No. 6973, we observe that PUR = abnu, "stone." Hence the syllable KUL has the meaning "cut" or "hew" in this borrowed Sumerian

compound. In Brünnow, No. 12135, ŠA.KUL = aḫḫullu, which Delitzsch, *HWB.*, 123, defines as a hatchet, mattock, or pickaxe. ŠA.KUL is evidently "that which hews," or "to cut something." In Brünnow, No. 12138, we have an ^{amēlu}ŠA.KUL.AG.A defined as a ḥēpû. As AG.A is a common termination of compound ideograms, meaning "to use, strike with, act, put in action," the analysis of the ideogram suggests that the ḥēpû is "the man who uses the KUL," or aḫḫullu. It is a legitimate inference that ^{amēlu}KUL is but a briefer method of saying the same thing; and we may venture to define this ideogram then as a ḥēpû, or "hewer." We further know that clearing away stones was not a feature of daily labor in the alluvial plains of Babylonia; and such unwonted employment would not naturally occur in the standard wage-scale. Further, the passages quoted by Delitzsch for aḫḫullu suggest exceptional uses of the tool. But the reed plays an enormous part in the cuneiform literature and allusions to cutting reeds may be found in various ideograms in Brünnow. The ^{amēlu}KUL of the Hammurabi Code we may fairly account to be a "hewer of wood," as the AV English Bible phrases it; a cutter of reeds, or one who clears away bushes or makes faggots.

A. H. GODBEY.

ISAIAH 66:11.

The word מִלֵּךְ is commonly translated "fulness," but is supposed by many to mean "mother's breast" from the fact that it is used as a synonym of מִלֵּךְ in this passage. The word has been connected with vulgar Arabic zize, *udder*, but it is not yet accepted generally that the word means breast or teat since no good reason could be given for such meaning beyond the context in this passage.

However, a passage in a yet unpublished text by Professor Craig at last clears up the matter by supplying a clear Semitic parallel. In K. 1285, Rev., lines 6-8, Prof. Craig's *Religious Texts*, page 6 of Vol. 1, occurs the following passage:

6. ṣiḥru atta Ashurbanipal ša umaššir-ka bēlûti-ka ilu šarrat Ninua

7. lakû atta Ashurbanipal ša ašba-ka in purki šarrat Ninua

8. irbi zizi-e ša ina pi-ka šakna te-en-ni-iḫ taḥallap ana pani-ka.

(6) A babe art thou Ashurbanipal unto whom the queen of Nineveh hath left a kingdom; (7) a meek babe art thou Ashurbanipal whose seat is on the lap of the queen of Nineveh; (8) the outflow of the teat which is in thy mouth thou suckest, thou hidest thy face in it.

This text settles the meaning of the word in Hebrew beyond all further discussion.

STEPHEN LANGDON.